

**State of Indiana
Indiana Commission for Higher Education**

CHE Framework Subcommittee

Minutes of Meeting

Thursday, November 9, 2006

I. Call to Order

The CHE Framework Subcommittee held its first meeting starting at 3:40 p.m. at the offices of the Indiana Commission for Higher Education, 101 West Ohio Street, Suite 550, Indianapolis, Indiana, with Chairman Jon Costas presiding.

II. Charge of Taskforce, Process, and Timeline

Mr. Costas restated the Subcommittee's charge of reviewing the current Framework document and making revisions as appropriate. He also presented a preliminary timeline for the Subcommittee's work.

Mr. Stan Jones indicated that Commission Member Richard Johnson has offered his cabin located in Brown County as a possible site for the Commission's retreat scheduled to occur in May 2007. It was suggested that staff explore the possibility of holding the retreat following the regular Friday Commission meeting scheduled on May 11, 2007. The retreat could be scheduled for that Friday afternoon and conclude around 3:00 p.m. on the following Saturday, May 12, 2007.

Ms. Moran-Townsend noted that Trustees, faculty, students, and representatives from the General Assembly and the business community should be involved as early as possible. She stated that the discussions with the students and Trustees scheduled for March and April would be too late in the process.

Mr. Costas noted that there would be multiple points of engaging all interested parties and that these groups would be invited to participate in the February conference.

Upon request, Mr. Jeff Stanley presented a brief overview of the process that was taken in developing the 2003 Framework. He noted that the Framework was developed by consensus working with Indiana's colleges and universities.

Several Subcommittee Members indicated strong interest in building legislative support for the Framework.

Mr. Michael Smith asked if the Commission staff had aspirations that were greater than that which was realized in the final text of the 2003 Framework.

Mr. Jones responded that the inclusion of bright lines in mission differentiation between the campuses was one such aspiration.

Mr. Chris Murphy noted that the 2003 Framework was a result of a considerable amount of negotiation.

Mr. Gerald Bepko noted that sometimes there is tension and misunderstanding due to a lot of people working in the same area without open channels of communication.

Mr. Jones noted that one such example is Indiana's Core 40 curriculum and the considerable amount of time that it took to become a minimum course requirement for admission to Indiana's four-year public colleges and universities.

Mr. Costas noted that we are now at a different place with the framework discussion as we are not starting with a blank sheet of paper. The 2003 Framework can serve as a starting place for discussing where we want to go.

Mr. Jones agreed with Mr. Costas adding that there needs to be a constant push to move to the next level. He noted that three such areas are transfer of credit, standards of entry-level college courses, and degree completion.

Mr. Murphy noted that he would like to see more bright lines in terms of mission differentiation between the institutions.

Mr. Jones indicated that he would like to see a subset of six to seven key broad system indicators that we could constantly monitor to track progress.

Mr. Bepko indicated that in terms of defining college curriculum that there are other factors that must be considered, particularly the role of faculty in writing the curriculum.

Mr. Smith noted that he would like some basic understanding of duties and responsibilities associated with educating students at the college level.

Mr. Costas asked the Subcommittee if the next framework document should be viewed from a different context.

Mr. Jones noted that if the Subcommittee is comfortable with the basic parameters of the 2003 Framework that they should consider it as a base for moving forward and improve it in a way that takes us to the next level.

Ms. Moran-Townsend indicated that the Subcommittee needs to consider how to get all stakeholders (legislators, educators, presidents, business leaders) behind whatever the Framework becomes. She also noted that the Framework should be the base for the Commission's annual work plan and associated meeting agendas.

Mr. Smith added that it also is imperative to engage the university trustees as they are an important part of ensuring bright lines of mission differentiation among the institutions.

Ms. Kathy Dale noted that there is a change when comparing where we were to where we are today. In the past, we were focused on getting more students into the system. She indicated that the question that we must ask now is whether or not these students that have been brought into the system are getting the education that they need to be successful. This deals

with quality. Ms. Dale also noted that this work must examine and define the purpose of state-sponsored education.

Mr. Smith added that bringing clarity into the financial aid process also should be added to the agenda. He noted that some people simply do not know how to access financial aid.

Mr. Murphy noted that he is interested in states and/or institutions that are making progress with measuring student learning.

Ms. Dale added that in the concept of student learning that we do not lose sight of other learning that occurs in college. She noted that she disagrees with the statement on page 2 of the 2003 Framework that indicates a waste of time for students not completing a degree. She noted that having the experience can have value even if the student did not complete a degree.

Mr. Murphy noted two areas that trouble him: 1) education found as the answer for everything; and 2) brain drain being a problem of colleges and universities rather than a problem of not developing businesses and better jobs.

Ms. Moran-Townsend noted that in terms of mission differentiation student expectations may be different for students attending and completing education at a global research university than at a community college.

Mr. Bepko stated that universities can play a role in economic development, and the relationship between a high-end research university and the economic community is vital. He stated that intelligent people with good, creative ideas drive growth.

Mr. Costas concluded this portion of the agenda by restating that the process would be to start with the 2003 Framework document and revise and improve it as the Subcommittee moves forward with the timeline that has been presented.

III. Background Presentation on 2003 CHE Framework and 2006 Spellings' Commission on Higher Education Report

Mr. Stanley distributed and presented an overview of a document that provided a side-by-side comparison of the 2003 CHE Framework and the 2006 Spellings' Commission on Higher Education Report.

IV. Other Background Information Needs/Requests

Mr. Costas asked if there were other background items or requests that needed to be brought forth.

Ms. Moran-Townsend asked that members of the House and Senate Education Committees be involved in the process.

Mr. Murphy stated that there is a small cadre of staff in the House and the Senate that understand the higher education budget and related issues and would view such a document favorably. He would like to see them engaged in the process.

Mr. Costas proposed that each Subcommittee member volunteer to become a subject matter expert in one of the six systemic goals identified in the 2003 Framework.

Mr. Bepko indicated that it would be helpful to have the institutions provide information to the Subcommittee on how they define themselves.

Mr. Murphy stated that he would like to see the institutions engaged early in this process. He indicated that time was to be held on the December and January regular Commission meetings to allow the presidents to make remarks on the Framework. He indicated that the presidents would be asked to respond to at least the following areas: 1) general reactions to the 2003 Framework in terms of areas that are on-target, areas that need to be strengthened, and areas that are absent and should be considered, 2) the alignment of the 2003 Framework to the institution's strategic plan, 3) the institution's fit into Indiana's higher education system, and 4) broad systemic metrics for assessing Indiana's higher education system.

Ms. Moran-Townsend noted that the Subcommittee needs to consider and address the vision for higher education in Indiana, the structure and alignment of the system, the role of public funding, building support for the framework, and metrics.

Ms. Dale stated that defining the vision should be the Subcommittee's first task.

Mr. Murphy noted that it is important for the Subcommittee to have a body of knowledge prior to defining the vision.

Ms. Dale stated that it is important for the Subcommittee to keep the full Commission updated on the Subcommittee's work on a regular basis.

Mr. Costas noted that there was value in the Subcommittee devoting time to developing a vision early in the process. Mr. Costas stated that there has been some discussion about retaining the services of Mr. Luke Messer and Mr. Lacy Johnson from Ice Miller to assist with our efforts of building support for the framework.

The Subcommittee discussed retaining Ice Miller in its efforts, and Mr. Costas indicated that a recommendation would be brought to the full Commission at its regular meeting on November 10, 2006.

V. Next Meeting/Adjourn

Mr. Costas stated that the next meeting was scheduled for Thursday, December 7, 2006 from 2:30 – 4:30 p.m. Topics of discussion would include the vision for higher education in Indiana and areas of specialization for each Subcommittee member.

Mr. Costas adjourned the meeting at 5:40 p.m.